



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/517,434	03/02/2000	JAHANGIR S. RASTEGAR	13285	4946

7590 05/22/2002

Paul J Esatto Jr  
Scully Scott Murphy & Presser  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Garden City, NY 11530

EXAMINER

BURCH, MELODY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3683

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/517,434

Applicant(s)

RASTEGAR ET AL.

Examiner

Melody M. Burch

Art Unit

3683

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 08 May 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Applicant's reply has overcome the new matter objection.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_


Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the argument that the parallel relationship between the base structure and the payload is maintained "over the range of motion of the motion constraint means" is more specific than the claim language. Examiner, therefore, maintains that, as broadly recited, the base and payload are "carried on" or "kept up" in parallel relationship for the given instant shown in the references for the duration of the instant. Additionally, Applicant argues that element 11 of the Macpherson reference does not serve to suppress either vertical or lateral vibrations between the base structure and the payload because it is described "as a rigid member". Examiner notes that it is old and well-known in the art that rigid structures are capable of suppressing or preventing vibration. See the English abstract attached to Japanese Patent JP-927682 which teaches in lines 2-3 under the section headed "Advantage" that rigid structures are used to prevent vibration. US Patent 4981381 to Murata also teaches in col. 4 lines 62-64 the use of a base body that is rigid and that suppresses vibrations. Examiner reiterates that it is the combination of Sutcliffe in view of Goldbach that teaches the claimed invention. It is maintained that the top and bottom plates of Sutcliffe, as modified, are movable with respect to each other by virtue of the presence of the resilient material found between the plates. Examiner also reiterates that it is old and well-known in the art to utilize payload isolation systems in rocket environments as evident in US Patent 5645260 to Falangas which was one of the previously cited references. As stated in the response to arguments of paper no. 8, it is apparent that using such a system in a rocket environment would inherently result in the payload having a varying weight as the value of gravity changed during the course of the rocket travel.

Continuation of 10. Other: Note the attached Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Paper No. 10.

  
JACK LAVINDER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600  
5/20/02